arXiv:1603.09021v4 [cs.SI] 25 Feb 2017

A Stochastic Differential Equation Framework for Guiding Online User Activities in Closed Loop

Yichen Wang[◇], Evangelos Theodorou[*], Apurv Verma[◇], and Le Song[◇]

[◇]College of Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology
[*]School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology
{yichen.wang,apurvverma,evangelos.theodorou}@gatech.edu, lsong@cc.gatech.edu

Abstract

Recently, there is a surge of interest in using point processes to model continuous-time online user activities. This framework has resulted in many novel models, new algorithms and improved performance in diverse applications such as information diffusion, timely recommendation and network evolution. However, most previous work has focused on the "open loop" setting where learned models are used mainly for predictive task. Very often we are interested in the "closed loop" setting where a policy needs to be learned to take into account online user feedbacks and guide user activities to a desirable target state. Although point process based method has led to good predictive performance, it is not clear how we can use them for the more challenging closed loop activity guiding task.

In this paper, we propose a framework to reformulate many point process based models into stochastic differential equations, which allows us to use and extend methods from stochastic control and reinforcement learning to address the user activity guiding problem. For our experiments, we also designed an efficient online algorithm, and show that our algorithm can guide user activities to desired states more effectively than open loop approaches.

1 Introduction

Online social and information platforms have brought to the public a new style of social lives: people use these platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter, to receive information, express their opinions and influence their peers. Nowadays, large-scale online user activity data with fine temporal resolutions are becoming increasingly available, which has fueled the increasing efforts in developing realistic models as well as learning and inference algorithms to understand, predict and distill knowledge from such data (Kempe et al., 2003; Du et al., 2013b; Rodriguez et al., 2013; Zhao et al., 2015; Grover & Leskovec, 2016; He & Liu, 2017).

Nowadays, there is an increasing interest in using temporal point processes to model the online user activity data. Instead of discretizing time into intervals, these models treat timestamps as random variables, and propose mechanism to link model parameters with the actual observed random timestamps. Such more fine-grained modeling of temporal information has resulted in many novel models, new algorithms and improved predictive performance in diverse applications, such as information diffusion (Du et al., 2013b), recommendation systems (Du et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016a), and network evolution (Farajtabar et al., 2015). However, most of these works deals with the so called "open loop" setting where learned models are used mainly for prediction, but user feedback and newly generated data are not incorporated into the model in a timely fashion (Du et al., 2013b,a; Farajtabar et al., 2015). Typically we are interested in the "closed loop" setting where we want to learn a policy to guide user activity and incorporate user feedbacks timely. It is not clear how the current models can be used for such "closed loop" guiding task.

For instance, a decision maker seeks a policy to determine the best external intervention such that the sentiment in user generated contents can be guided towards a positive state. This is significantly more



Figure 1: Comparison between our work and previous works in guiding user activities.

challenging than traditional influence maximization or activity shaping tasks (Kempe et al., 2003; Farajtabar et al., 2014) where the intervention is determined before the process unfolds, and they do not take into account the instantiation of the process. A framework for doing this is critically important for understanding the vulnerabilities of information networks, designing policies to suppress the spread of undesired contents, and exploring new ways of performing content recommendation. For instance, a network moderator may want to effectively contain the spread of rumors and misinformation, and an online platform may want to promote the level of long term activities of users rather than the short term click through rate.

In this paper, we provide a novel view of point process based models, and reformulate them into stochastic differential equations. The novel reformulation allows us to significantly generalize existing point process based user activity models, and plays a critical role in connecting the task of guiding user activity to stochastic optimal control and reinforcement learning, which are often used in robotic research. Hence, we can bring in lots of tools from stochastic optimal control literature to address the sequential decision making problems in the "closed loop" online user activity guiding problem. Figure 1 illustrates our framework.

Interestingly, these real problems also introduces new technical challenges. Previously, stochastic optimal control and reinforcement learning has mostly studied systems driven by Wiener processes and/or Poisson processes. Online user activity modeling requires us to consider more advanced processes, such as (i) multivariate Hawkes processes for long term memory and mutual exciting phenomena in online social interactions, (ii) survival process for self-terminating behavior in influence propagation and link creation, and (iii) time-varying networks with node birth processes which are models for real world evolving networks (Farajtabar et al., 2015). Thus many of the technical results from traditional literature need to be extended for user activity modeling and guiding problems. In summary, our paper also makes the following technical contributions:

- We provide a general way to reformulate point process based user activity models into Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs), which allows us to bring in tools from stochastic control to address the "closed loop" activity guiding problem.
- We extend the technical results in stochastic optimal control theory and derive generalized Ito's lemma and HJB equation for SDEs driven by more general point processes.
- We propose an algorithm which can efficiently guide user activity dynamics towards a target while reducing the variance. The algorithm can also deal with the challenging cases of time-varying networks and networks with node births.

Finally, with synthetic and real networks, we showed our framework is robust, able to steer user activities to desired states with faster convergence rate and less variance than state-of-arts.

2 Backgrounds and Preliminaries

Related work. Most previous works in influence maximization (Kempe et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2009, 2010a,b, 2012) focus on selecting the nodes of information sources to maximize the spread of information in infinite time window, which are "open loop" setting. First, the state of each user is often assumed to be binary, either adopting a product or not. Second, there is typically no quantitative prescription on how much incentive should be provided to each user. Moreover, in most cases, a finite time window must be considered. For example, a politician would like to maximize his support by a million people in one week, rather than in fifty years. Recently, (Epanchin-Niell & Wilen, 2012; Nowzari et al., 2016) studied the control of epidemic process (Pastor-Satorras et al., 2015) that is modeled by a continuous and deterministic differential equation. However, these works neither consider the influence of discrete abrupt event nor the stochasticity in the system, which is important in social applications. The recent Hawkes process based user activity models (Farajtabar et al., 2014; De et al., 2015) overcome the limitation and consider how to design the baseline intensity to achieve desired steady state behavior for stable systems. However, they do not consider system feedback, and the variance of the dynamics can still be very large. In contrast, our method can incorporate system feedback and adaptively determine the control policy. As for works in stochastic optimal control, the jump diffusion SDE is closely related. However, most of the works (Hanson, 2007; Oksendal & Sulem, 2005) focus on SDEs driven by Poisson processes. Hence significant generalizations are needed for the case of user online activity modeling where more complex point processes need to be used.

Point processes. We first provide necessary concepts of temporal point process (Daley & Vere-Jones, 2007). It is a random process whose realization consists of a list of events in time, $\{t_i\}$. Many types of data produced in social networks can be represented as point processes (Farajtabar et al., 2014; Du et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016b). The point process can be equivalently represented as a counting process, $N(t)$, which records number of events before time t.

An important way to characterize temporal point processes is via the conditional intensity function $\lambda(t)$, a stochastic model for the time of the next event given all the times of previous events. Let $\mathcal{H}(t) = \{t_i | t_i < t\}$ be the history of events happened up to t. Formally, $\lambda(t)$ is the conditional probability of observing an event in a small window $[t, t + dt)$ given the history $\mathcal{H}(t)$, *i.e.*,

$$\lambda(t)\mathrm{d}t := \mathbb{P}\left\{\text{event in } [t, t + \mathrm{d}t) | \mathcal{H}(t)\right\} = \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{d}N(t) | \mathcal{H}(t)], \tag{1}$$

where one typically assumes that only one event can happen in a window of $\mathrm{d}t$, *i.e.*, $\mathrm{d}N(t) \in \{0, 1\}$. The form of $\lambda(t)$ is often designed to capture the phenomena of interests. We will provide more examples later in section 3.

Stochastic differential equations (SDEs). A SDE is a differential equation in which one or more of the terms is a stochastic process. The Jump-diffusion SDE models the evolution of state $x(t)$ with a drift, diffusion and jump term:

$$\mathrm{d}x(t) = f(x, t)\mathrm{d}t + g(x, t)\mathrm{d}w(t) + h(x, t)\mathrm{d}N(t) \tag{2}$$

where $\mathrm{d}x(t) := x(t + \mathrm{d}t) - x(t)$ describes the increment of $x(t)$ in $[t, t + \mathrm{d}t)$. $\{f, g, h\}$ are continuous functions. The drift term is $f\mathrm{d}t$ and models the intrinsic continuous-time evolution. The diffusion term is the Wiener process $w(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t)$ that follows a Gaussian distribution and captures the noise. The jump term is the point process $N(t)$ that captures the influence of abrupt events.

To simulate the SDE on $[0, T]$, we divide the window into timestamps $\{t_k\}$, with $\Delta t = t_{k+1} - t_k$, and use the Euler method (Hanson, 2007) to compute the difference form of (2) : $x(t_{k+1}) = x(t_k) + f(x(t_k))\Delta t + g(x(t_k))\Delta w(t_k) + h(x_k)\Delta N(t_k)$. The Wiener increments $\Delta w(t_k)$ is sampled from the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sqrt{\Delta t})$. To compute $\Delta N(t_k)$, we simulate the point process on $[0, T]$ by the thinning algorithm (Ogata, 1981), and $\Delta N(t_k)$ is the number of events on $[t_k, t_{k+1})$. **Notation.** Bold symbols, *e.g.*, $\boldsymbol{x}$ represents column vector, while non-bold symbols with subscripts x_i are individual components.

3 Stochastic Differential Equations for Point Process Models

In this section, we will first establish a framework to reformulate many common point process models into stochastic differential equations (Theorem 2). This reformulation framework plays a critical role in connecting the task of guiding user activity to stochastic optimal control and reinforcement learning often used in robotic research. Hence, we can bring in lots of tools from stochastic optimal control literature to address the "closed loop" online user activity guiding problem.

3.1 Point Process Models

We first introduce the generic point process models for user activities, and present three examples.

Definition 1 (User Activity Model). *For a network with U users, the point process $N_i(t)$ models the generation of event times from user i, and its intensity is as follows:*

$$\lambda_i(t) = \eta_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{U} \beta_{ij} \sum_{t_j \in \mathcal{H}_j(t)} \kappa_{\omega_1}(t - t_j), \tag{3}$$

where $\eta_i(t)$ is the base intensity for user i, $\beta_{ij} \geqslant 0$ models the strength of influence from user j to user i, $\mathcal{H}_j(t)$ is the history of events up to time t for user j, and $\kappa_{\omega_1}(t) = \exp(-\omega_1 t)$ is the triggering kernel capturing the influence of each past event.

We also suppose additional event feature/content $x_i(t)$ for user i follows the model:

$$x_i(t) = \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ base}}{b_i(t)} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij} \sum_{t_j \in \mathcal{H}_j(t)} \kappa_{\omega_2}(t - t_j)\, h(x_j(t_j))}_{influence\ from\ neighbor} \tag{4}$$

where $b_i(t)$ is the base content, α_{ij} is the influence weight from user j to i, function $h(\cdot)$ is an application-dependent function capturing the influence of activity content.

This user activity model is a generalization of point processes, since it not only models the on-off temporal behavior of user, but also models the information content/activity feature $x_i(t)$, *e.g.*, opinion or a vector of interested topics. More specifically, it captures both exogenous and endogenous properties of social networks. The exogenous term is the base content $b_i(t)$, and the endogenous term captures the phenomena that one's activity content, is influenced by neighbors. The adjacency matrix $\boldsymbol{A} = (\alpha_{ij})$ measures the strength of such influence, the kernel $\kappa_\omega(t)$ captures the decay of influence of past events over time. $h(x)$ captures the form of influence, and typical forms include $h = 1$ and $h(x) = x$. Hence the summation term captures how the information content of each history event influences that of user i. Next, we provide several examples:

- **Continuous-time information propagation** (Du et al., 2013b). The information propagation in the direct social network begins with a set of source nodes, and the contagion is transmitted from the sources along their out-going edges to their direct neighbors. We set $N_{ij}(t)$ to be the *survival process* capturing the infection on the edge $i \to j$, and $N_{ij}(t) = 1$ means node j is infected by node i at time t. Since there is only one event for an instantiation of this process, we set the infection intensity as:

  $$\lambda_{ij}(t) = \eta_{ij}(1 - N_{ij}(t)) \tag{5}$$

  where η_{ij} is intensity that i infects j, and $(1 - N_{ji}(t))$ ensures the infection happens once, and $\lambda_{ij}(t)$ becomes 0 after that.

- **Multivariate Hawkes process** (Hawkes, 1971). The Hawkes process efficiently captures users behavior patterns, as shown in many information diffusion works (Zhou et al., 2013; Farajtabar et al., 2014, 2015; Du et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016b,c). The process $N_i(t)$ counts the number of events generated by user i up to time t and its intensity $\lambda_i(t)$ models mutual excitation between the events from a collection of U users as follows.

  $$\lambda_i(t) = \eta_i + \sum_{j=1}^{U} \beta_{ij} \sum_{t_j \in \mathcal{H}_j(t)} \kappa_{\omega_1}(t - t_j) \tag{6}$$

where η_i is the base intensity for node i, and $\alpha_{ij} \geqslant 0$ models the strength of influence from user j to user i. Here, the occurrence of each historical event from one's neighbors increases the intensity by a certain amount determined by $\kappa_{\omega_1}(t)$ and α_{ij}.

- **Opinion dynamics** (De et al., 2015; He et al., 2015). This model considers both the timing and content of each event. It assigns each user i a Hawkes intensity $\lambda_i(t)$ and an opinion process $x_i(t)$ where $x_i(t) = 0$ corresponds to neutral opinion. The opinion of user i is modeled as a temporally discounted average of neighbors' opinion:

$$x_i(t) = b_i + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij} \sum\nolimits_{t_j \in \mathcal{H}_j(t)} \kappa_{\omega_2}(t - t_j) x_j(t_j) \tag{7}$$

  This model has superior performance in predicting opinions. However, it is not clear whether it can be used to design feedback policies to guide the dynamics precisely to some target states.

3.2 SDE Reformulation

We now show the novel reformulation of the user activity model.

Theorem 2 (Transformation Framework)**.** *The SDE form of the user activity model is:*

$$\mathrm{d}\lambda_i(t) = \mathrm{d}\eta_i(t) + \omega_1\big(\eta_i(t) - \lambda_i(t)\big)\mathrm{d}t + \sum\nolimits_j \beta_{ij}\mathrm{d}N_j(t) \tag{8}$$

$$\mathrm{d}x_i(t) = \mathrm{d}b_i(t) + \omega_2\big(b_i(t) - x_i(t)\big)\mathrm{d}t + \sum\nolimits_j \alpha_{ij} h(x_j)\mathrm{d}N_j(t) \tag{9}$$

Appendix A contains proofs. The SDEs describe how $\lambda_i(t)$ and $x_i(t)$ change on $[t, t + \mathrm{d}t)$:

(i) *the baseline change.* $\mathrm{d}b_i(t)$ captures how the base activity content changes. Similarly $\mathrm{d}\eta_i(t)$ captures how base intensity changes.

(ii) *the drift term.* The change rate of user i's activity content, $\mathrm{d}x_i(t)/\mathrm{d}t$, is proportional to the negative of $x_i(t)$, which means $x_i(t)$ tends to stabilize over time. Moreover, if ignoring the jump term and $\mathrm{d}b_i(t)$, the expected activity content $\mathbb{E}[x_i(t)]$ will converge to $b_i(t)$ as time goes by. This can be seen by setting $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{d}x_i(t)] = 0$. Similarly, a user's intensity also tends to stabilize over time.

(iii) *the jump term.* It captures the *discrete increment*: it is a weighted summation of the neighbors' influence. α_{ij} ensure only the user's neighbor will be considered and $\mathrm{d}N_j(t) \in \{0, 1\}$ captures whether an event happens for user j. Similarly, (8) says that the user's intensity increases by β_{ij} if his neighbor j generates an event. In summary, there is a nice equivalence: (4) models how neighbors influence $x_i(t)$, and (9) shows how they influence $\mathrm{d}x_i(t)$.

Next, we show three applications of Theorem 2.

- **SDE for information propagation**. The intensity in (5) is a simplified version of (3) without the neighbor influence term. We set $\eta_{ij}(t) = \eta_{ij}(1 - N_{ij}(t))$ and reformulate (5) as:

$$\mathrm{d}\lambda_{ij}(t) = -\eta_{ij}\mathrm{d}N_{ij}(t) \tag{10}$$

  This SDE is intuitive: before any infection happens, $\lambda_{ij}(t) = \eta_{ij}$; if the infection happens at t, $\mathrm{d}N_{ij}(t) = 1$, and $\lambda_{ij}(t + \mathrm{d}t) = \lambda_{ij}(t) + \mathrm{d}\lambda_{ij}(t) = 0$. Hence it keeps the key property of the survival process that the intensity is set to 0 after an event happens.

- **SDE for Hawkes process**. We set $\eta_i(t) = \eta_i$ and obtain:

$$\mathrm{d}\lambda_i(t) = \omega_1\big(\eta_i - \lambda_i(t)\big)\mathrm{d}t + \sum\nolimits_j \alpha_{ij}\mathrm{d}N_j(t) \tag{11}$$

  This SDE means the user's intensity tends to stabilize and the change of intensity is influenced by his neighbors' activities.

- **SDE for opinion dynamics.** We set $b_i(t) = b_i$, and $h_j(x_j) = x_j$, and further generalize it and add one Wiener process term:

$$\mathrm{d}x_i(t) = \omega_2\big(b_i - x_i(t)\big)\mathrm{d}t + \beta \mathrm{d}w_i(t) + \sum\nolimits_j \alpha_{ij} x_j(t)\mathrm{d}N_j(t) \tag{12}$$

  where the Wiener process $\mathrm{d}w_i(t)$ captures the noise, *i.e.*, fluctuations in the dynamics due to unobserved factors such as activity outside the social platform. The jump term models one's opinion change is influenced by his neighbors' opinion.

3.3 Benefit of the SDE Modeling Framework

Our SDE formulation for user activity models is important. It opens the new gate to stochastic optimal theory to solve many important social problems such as least square activity guiding and activity maximization. Without this SDE view, it will not be easy to design stochastic optimal control algorithms with closed loop policy.

Besides transforming an existing model to a SDE, we can also directly design the SDE model to take account of many other factors, *e.g.*, one can add the Wiener process to enrich the SDE by capturing the Gaussian noise, such as the opinion SDE in (12). Next, we show how to optimally control the SDE to guide user activity. For the simplicity of notation, we set $\boldsymbol{x}(t) = \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}(t) = \boldsymbol{u}$.

4 A Convex Activity Guiding Framework

In this section, we will define the novel activity guiding problem. To guide $\boldsymbol{x}(t) \in \Re^U$ in (9), we reformulate this SDE with an extra control policy $\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}(t), t) \in \Re^U$ as follows.

$$\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}(t) = \big(\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + \boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big)\mathrm{d}t + \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t) + \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) \tag{13}$$

The policy $\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}(t), t)$ is a closed loop policy and depends on the activity content $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$ at each time t. Next we show two examples.

Guiding Hawkes process. To steer the community to a desired level, we can control the baseline intensity of the Hawkes process by providing incentives to users. To do this, we add a control policy $u_i(\lambda_i(t), t)$ to the Hawkes intensity SDE in (11) as follows:

$$\mathrm{d}\lambda_i(t) = (\eta_i + u_i(\lambda_i(t), t) - \lambda_i(t))\mathrm{d}t + \sum\nolimits_j \alpha_{ij}\mathrm{d}N_j(t)$$

where $\eta_i + u_i(\lambda_i(t), t)$ is the exogenous intensity and the practical meaning of $u_i(\lambda_i(t), t)$ is that it captures the amount of additional influence to change the baseline intensity η_i for user i.

Guiding opinion dynamics. We can also guide the opinion SDE with an extra control policy $u_i(x_i, t)$ as follows:

$$\mathrm{d}x_i(t) = (b_i + u_i(x_i, t) - x_i(t))\mathrm{d}t + \beta \mathrm{d}w_i(t) + \sum\nolimits_j \alpha_{ij} x_j \mathrm{d}N_j(t) \tag{14}$$

here $u_i(x_i, t)$ determines how fast the opinion needs to be changed for user i. A network moderator may request the user to change his opinion from -3 to 1 in one day, and this policy quantifies the amount of change that needs to be made in unit time. Next, we present the objective function for optimizing the SDE.

Definition 3 (Stochastic Activity Guiding Problem)**.** *For the SDE in (13), given $(\boldsymbol{x}_0, t_0)$, we aim to find an optimal policy $\boldsymbol{u}^*(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ for $t \in (t_0, T]$, which minimizes the convex objective function:*

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}_0, t_0) := \min_{\boldsymbol{u}(\boldsymbol{x}, t), t \in (t_0, T]} \mathbb{E}\Big[\phi\big(\boldsymbol{x}(T)\big) + \int_{t_0}^{T} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, t)\mathrm{d}t\Big] \tag{15}$$

where V is called the Value Function that summarizes the optimal expected cost if $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ is executed from time t_0 to T. It is a function of the initial state, since the optimal value depends on the initial state. The expectation $\mathbb{E}$ is over stochastic processes $\{\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{N}(t)\}$ for $t \in (t_0, T]$. ϕ is terminal cost and $\mathcal{L}$ is the instantaneous cost.

Terminal cost ϕ. It is the cost at final time T and a necessary term. We discuss several cases as follows:

- **Least Square Guiding.** The goal is to guide the expected state to the pre-specified target $\boldsymbol{a}$ at final time T. For opinion dynamics, the goal can be to ensure nobody believes the rumor at final time. Mathematically, we set $\phi = \|\boldsymbol{x}(T) - \boldsymbol{a}\|^2$. Moreover, to influence users' intensity of generating events, one can set the desired level of the intensity function to be at a high level $\boldsymbol{a}$ and conduct activity guiding: $\phi = \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}(T) - \boldsymbol{a}\|^2$.
- **Information/Activity Maximization.** The goal is to maximize the activity content of all users, *e.g.*, the goal for an educator is to maximize the students' recognition of the value of education, and we set $\phi = -\sum_u x_u(T)$ to maximize each user's positive opinion. Moreover, to improve the activity level in social platforms, one can also maximize the intensity: $\phi = -\sum_u \lambda_u(T)$.

Instantaneous cost $\mathcal{L}$. This is the cost at any $t \in [t_0, T]$ and is in the form of $\mathcal{L} = q(\boldsymbol{x}) + \rho c(\boldsymbol{u})$. The *state cost* $q(\boldsymbol{x})$ is optional and a *control cost* $c(\boldsymbol{u})$ is always necessary. We set $q = 0$ if the state cost only occurs at final time T. Otherwise q is necessary since it is the cost at any intermediate time, *i.e.*, maximizing the positive opinion influence (*e.g.*, students' recognition of the value of education) over consecutive weeks. Its form is typically same as the terminal cost, *i.e.*, $q = \phi$. The control cost is $c(\boldsymbol{u}) = \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^2$. It models the scenarios that the policy typically costs money or human efforts. The scalar ρ controls the trade-off between the control cost and state cost. Large ρ means small control budget. Finally, we sum up all the instantaneous cost by taking the integration on $[t_0, T]$.

Our activity guiding problem is much more general and challenging than traditional influence maximization and activity shaping problem (Kempe et al., 2003; Farajtabar et al., 2014; De et al., 2015) due to our definition of *instantaneous cost* and the *feedback control* policy. First, we can not only consider the cost at the final time, but also control the system *during a period* with intermediate cost. Controlling the system during a period is much more challenging than only at terminal time. The forms of the cost functions also contain a wide range of applications. Most importantly, we seek to find a control policy that is updated according to the feedback of current state over time. It is more challenging than prior works that fix the policy only at the initial time.

Solving the activity guiding problem is challenging, since the objective involves taking expectation over complex stochastic process. Furthermore, it is a functional optimization problem since the optimal policy is a function of both state and time. Fortunately, the SDE formulations allow us to connect the problem to that of stochastic dynamic programming methods. As a result, we can extend lots of tools in stochastic optimal control to address sequential decision making problems.

5 Algorithm for Optimal Policy

In this section we will find the optimal control posed in (15). Prior works in control theory all study the SDE where the jump is a Poisson process (Oksendal & Sulem, 2005; Hanson, 2007). However, in our model, the jump term is a more complex process, *e.g.*, Hawkes process. Hence significant generalizations, both in theory and algorithms, are needed. We first derive the HJB equation for a deterministic system, then generalize the procedure to our stochastic activity guiding problem. Further, we extend to the challenging time-varying networks.

5.1 HJB Equation for Deterministic Systems

To obtain the optimal control, we need to compute the value function V in (15) subject to the constraint of the SDE in (13). A typical way to solve this sequence of optimization problems is to break down the complex optimization into simpler subproblems. First, the fixed initial condition $\boldsymbol{x}(t_0)$ needs to be replaced by a more arbitrary start, $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$, so that the start can be analytically manipulated and we obtain a time-varying objective $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ amenable to analysis.

Next, since the value function consists of an integral term, we break the integral into $[t, t+\mathrm{d}t]$ and $[t+\mathrm{d}t, T]$. If the system is *deterministic*, we can further split (15) as:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = \underbrace{\min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \Big[\phi + \int_{t+\mathrm{d}t}^{T-} \mathcal{L}\, \mathrm{d}\tau}_{V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t), t+\mathrm{d}t)} + \underbrace{\int_{t}^{t+\mathrm{d}t} \mathcal{L}\, \mathrm{d}\tau}_{\text{cost } t \to t+\mathrm{d}t} \Big] \tag{16}$$

The first term is the optimal cost starting from $t+\mathrm{d}t$ and the second term is the optimal cost on $[t, t+\mathrm{d}t]$. Hence the form of (16) follows the structure of a *dynamic programming* and we can solve the problem recursively: If we know $V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t), t+\mathrm{d}t)$, we only need to proceed optimally on $[t, t+\mathrm{d}t]$ to compute $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ backward.

To further simplify (16), we perform deterministic Taylor expansion up to second order of the first term on right-hand side as $V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t), t+\mathrm{d}t) := V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + \mathrm{d}V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$, where

$$\mathrm{d}V = V_t \mathrm{d}t + V_x^\top \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}^\top V_{xx} \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} + \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}^\top V_{xt} \mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{2} V_{tt} \mathrm{d}t^2$$

Then we can cancel $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ on both sides of (16), divide it by $\mathrm{d}t$, and take the limit as $\mathrm{d}t \to 0$. Since $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}'(t)\mathrm{d}t$, all the second order term in $\mathrm{d}V$ goes to 0. Hence we obtain **Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman** (HJB) equation: $-V_t = \min_u [\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, t) + V_x^\top \boldsymbol{x}']$.

However, our system is stochastic and the above procedure needs to be generalized significantly. While the HJB equation and dynamic programming have been studied in SDEs driven by Poisson processes, the generalization to point process with stochastic intensity functions, such as Hawkes process, is inexistent to date.

5.2 HJB Equation for User Activities

To derive the HJB equation for our user activity model, we need to solve two challenges: (i) compute the *stochastic* Taylor expansion $\mathrm{d}V$ under our SDE, which is not a simple deterministic form, and (ii) take the expectation of the stochastic terms in (16) before minimization. Solving these two challenges require the knowledge of Ito mean square limit, the stochastic calculus, and the survival analysis theory of point processes. We summarize solutions below.

We first derive Theorem 4 to compute $\mathrm{d}V$. It significantly generalizes the Ito's lemma for Poisson process and applies to general SDE driven by general point processes. Then we handle the expectation challenge and derive the stochastic HJB equation in Theorem 5. Appendix B and C contain proofs.

Theorem 4. *Given the SDE in (13), let $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ be a twice differentiable function in $\boldsymbol{x}$ and once in t, then we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}V = &\Big\{V_t + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}} \boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^\top) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top (\boldsymbol{f} + \boldsymbol{u})\Big\}\mathrm{d}t + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{g} \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w} \\ &+ \big(V(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{h}, t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Theorem 5. *HJB equation for the activity guiding problem is:*

$$-V_t = \min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \Big[\mathcal{L} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\big(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}} \boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^\top\big) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top (\boldsymbol{f} + \boldsymbol{u}) \tag{18}$$

$$+ \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \lambda_j(t)\big(V(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}, t), t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big)\Big] \tag{19}$$

where $\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ is the j-th column of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$.

The HJB equation is a key representation of the value function, since the expectation over the complex system $\{\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{N}(t)\}$ for $t \in [t_0, T]$ has been handled. It is a partial differential equation and *its solution is the value function*. Next we show under the optimal parameterization of the value function, it can be solved efficiently.

Algorithm 1 Optimal Control Policy

Input: target state $\boldsymbol{a}$, network $\boldsymbol{A}$, model parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \beta, \boldsymbol{b}\}$, timestamps $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^m$, events $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^n$
Output: $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(\tau_k), \boldsymbol{v}_1(\tau_k)$, $k = 1, \cdots, m$
for $k = 1$ **to** m **do**
  Compute $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_u(\tau_k) = \eta_u + \sum_{j:t_i<\tau_k} \alpha_{uu_i}\kappa(\tau_k - t_i)$, $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\tau_k) = \sum_{j=1}^U \lambda_j(\tau_k)\boldsymbol{B}^j$ for each user u
end for
Compute $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(\tau_k), \boldsymbol{v}_1(\tau_k)$ using Ode45. Then compute $\boldsymbol{u}(\tau_k)$ in (21).

5.3 Parameterization of the Value Function

To solve the HJB equation, we first show the structure of value function $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ in the following proposition.

Proposition 6. *If the SDE (13) is linear in the state $\boldsymbol{x}$, and the terminal and instantaneous cost are quadratic/linear in $\boldsymbol{x}$, then the value function $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ in (15) must be quadratic/linear.*

Appendix D contains proofs. This result is intuitive since the V is the optimal value of the summation of quadratic/linear functions. It is applicable to two important activity guiding problems: in the least square guiding, V is quadratic; in the information maximization problem, V is linear.

Here we show derivations for the least square guiding problem. Appendix F contains derivations for the opinion maximization problem. We set $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ to be quadratic in $\boldsymbol{x}$ with *unknown* coefficients $\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) \in \Re^U$, $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t) \in \Re^{U\times U}$ and $v_0(t) \in \Re$:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = v_0(t) + \boldsymbol{v}_1(t)^\top \boldsymbol{x} + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\boldsymbol{x} \tag{20}$$

To find the optimal control, we substitute (20) to HJB equation and take the gradient of the right-hand side of (18) with respect to $\boldsymbol{u}$ and set it to $\mathbf{0}$. This yields the **optimal feedback control policy**:

$$\boldsymbol{u}^*(\boldsymbol{x}(t), t) = -\frac{1}{\rho}V_{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\Big(\underbrace{\boldsymbol{v}_1(t)}_{\text{feedforward}} + \underbrace{\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\boldsymbol{x}(t)}_{\text{feedback}} \Big) \tag{21}$$

The optimal policy moves to the negative partial gradient $-V_{\boldsymbol{x}}$. It is intuitive since it minimizes V. This policy consists of two terms.

- The feedforward term captures the baseline control policy: how one should control the system as time goes by.
- The *feedback* term captures how one can update the policy based on the current state $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$ at time t. It is appealing since we update the policy in closed loop optimally. Hence we make use of the valuable information efficiently, while prior works can only fix the policy at initial time and not able to adaptively change it.

Moreover, since ρ controls the tradeoff between control and state cost, setting $\rho \to \infty$ means low budget, hence $\boldsymbol{u}^* \to \mathbf{0}$.

5.4 Stochastic Optimal Control Algorithm

The final step is to find $\{\boldsymbol{v}_1(t), \boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\}$ to obtain $\boldsymbol{u}^*(\boldsymbol{x}(t), t)$. We first substitute $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ in (21) back to the HJB equation in (18). Since $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ is quadratic, we can separate the HJB equation into terms that are quadratic in $\boldsymbol{x}$, linear, and scalar. Grouping coefficients of these terms leads to Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs) as follows (Appendix E contains derivations).

Update $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)$. Setting $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^U \lambda_j(t)\boldsymbol{B}^j$, where matrix $\boldsymbol{B}^j$ has the j-th column to be $(\alpha_{1j}, \cdots, \alpha_{Uj})^\top$ and zero elsewhere, we solve the ODE with $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(T) = \boldsymbol{I}$:

$$-\boldsymbol{v}_{11}'(t) = \boldsymbol{I} + 2\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(-1 + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) - \boldsymbol{v}_{11}^2(t)/\rho + \sum\nolimits_j \lambda_j(t)\boldsymbol{B}^{j\top}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\boldsymbol{B}^j$$

Update $\boldsymbol{v}_1(t)$. We solve the ODE with $\boldsymbol{v}_1(T) = -\boldsymbol{a}$:

$$-\boldsymbol{v}_1'(t) = -\boldsymbol{a} + \big(-1 + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\top - \boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)/\rho\big)\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) + \boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\boldsymbol{b}$$

Online updates. The ODEs can be solved offline with the Runge-Kutta algorithm (Dormand & Prince, 1980). We partition $(t_0, T]$ to equally-spaced timestamps $\{\tau_k\}$ and then obtain values of $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t), \boldsymbol{v}_1(t)$ at these timestamps. We use the ODE45 Solver in MATLAB. Finally we use (21) to update the policy *online* and adaptively to current state $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$. Algorithm 1 summarizes the procedure.

5.5 Extensions to Time-Varying Networks

The real world social network can change over time. Users can follow or unfollow each other as time goes by and new users can join the network (Farajtabar et al., 2015). Our framework can be further extended to networks with time-varying edges and node birth.

For a fixed network, the expectation in the objective (15) is over the stochastic pair $\{\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{N}(t)\}$ on $(t_0, T]$. Since the network is stochastic now, we also need to take the expectation of the adjacency matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(t) = (\alpha_{ij}(t))$ to derive the HJB equation. Hence the input to Algorithm 1 is $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{A}(t)] = (\mathbb{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)])$ instead of $\boldsymbol{A}$. Specifically, we replace $\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x})$ in the HJB equation (19) by $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x})]$:

$$\sum\nolimits_j \lambda_j(t)(V(\boldsymbol{x} + \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}, t)], t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)) \tag{22}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}, t)] = (\mathbb{E}[h_{1j}(t)], \cdots, \mathbb{E}[h_{Uj}(t)])^\top$ and $\mathbb{E}[h_{ij}(t)] = \mathbb{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)]x_j(t)$. Next, we compute $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)]$ in two types of networks.

Networks with link creation. We model link creation $i \to j$ as a survival process $\alpha_{ij}(t)$. If a link is created, $\alpha_{ij}(t) = 1$ and zero otherwise. Its intensity is defined as:

$$\sigma_{ij}(t) = (1 - \alpha_{ij}(t))\gamma_i \tag{23}$$

where the term $\gamma_i \geqslant 0$ denotes the Poisson intensity, which models the node i's own initiative to create links to others. Given a sequence of link creation events, we can learn $\{\gamma_i\}$ using maximum likelihood estimation (Aalen et al., 2008). Appendix I contains details. Next, we obtain the following ordinary differential equation that describes the time-evolution of $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)]$:

$$\mathrm{d}\mathbb{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] \underset{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}[\mathrm{d}\alpha_{ij}(t)] \underset{(b)}{=} \sigma_{ij}(t)\mathrm{d}t \underset{(c)}{=} (1 - \mathbb{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)])\gamma_i \mathrm{d}t \tag{24}$$

where (a) holds because the operator d and $\mathbb{E}$ are exchangable, (b) is from the definition in (1), and (c) is from (23). The initial condition is $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_{ij}(0)] = 0$ since i and j are not connected initially. We can easily solve (24) in analytical form : $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] = 1 - \exp(-\gamma_i t)$.

Node birth. The network's dimension can grow as new users join it. It is very challenging to control such network, since the dimension of $\boldsymbol{A}(t)$ changes over time. It remains unknown how to derive the HJB equation for such case. We propose an efficient method by connecting the stochasticity of node birth to that of link creation. More specifically, we have the following observation.

Observation. *The process of adding a new user v to the existing network $\boldsymbol{A} \in \Re^{(N-1)\times(N-1)}$ and connects to user s is equivalent to link creation process of setting $\boldsymbol{A}(t) \in \Re^{N\times N}$ to be the existing network and letting* $\alpha_{vs}(t) = 1$.

With this novel observation, we can fix the dimension of $\boldsymbol{A}(t)$ to be the maximum number of nodes at terminal time, and adds a link whenever a user joins the network. This procedure is memory-efficient since we do not need to maintain a sequence of size-growing matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(t)$. More importantly, we transform the stochasticity of the network's dimension to the stochasticity of link creation process with fixed network dimension. Finally, the difference between link creation and node birth is: we control each node in the link creation case, but do not control the node until it joins the network in the node birth case.

6 Experiments

We focus on two tasks: least square opinion guiding (LSOG) and opinion influence maximization (OIM). We evaluate our framework using synthetic and real world data, and compare with the following state-of-arts in reinforcement learning and heuristics.



(a) Total cost/opinion (b) Instantaneous cost/opinion (c) Our Trajectory (d) CE Trajectory

Figure 2: Experiments on least square opinion guiding (LSOG) and opinion influence maximization (OIM). (a) total cost for LSOG and total opinion for OIM per user. Error bar is the variance; (b) instantaneous cost/opinion per user over time. Line is the mean and pale region is the variance; (c) and (d) sample opinion trajectory of five users.

- **Cross Entropy** (Stulp & Sigaud, 2012): It samples policies from a Gaussian distribution, sorts them in ascending order w.r.t. the cost and recomputes the distribution parameters from the first K elite samples. Then repeats with new distribution until costs converge.
- **Finite Difference** (Peters & Schaal, 2006): It approximates the gradient of the expected cost with respect to the control policy.
- **Greedy**: It controls the system when the local state cost is high. Specifically, we divide the time horizon into n observation timestamps. At each timestamp, Greedy computes state cost and controls the system based on pre-specified control rules if current cost is more than k times of the optimal cost of our method. It will stop if it reaches the current budget upper bound. We vary k from 1 to 5, n from 1 to 100 and report the best performance.
- **Slant** (De et al., 2015): It sets the open loop control policy only at the initial time to achieve the target state.

6.1 Experiments on Synthetic Data

Experimental setup. We consider a network with 1000 users. We simulate the opinion SDE on the observation window $[0, 10]$ by applying Euler forward method (Hanson, 2007) to compute its difference form. The window is divided into 100 timestamps $\{t_k\}$, with interval $\Delta t = 0.1$. We set the baseline opinion uniformly at random, $b_i \sim \mathcal{U}[-1, 1]$, $\omega = 1$, noise level $\beta = 0.2$, adjacency matrix (α_{ij}) with sparsity of 0.001 and $\alpha_{ij} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 0.01]$, initial opinion $x_i(0) = -10$. The Wiener process is simulated from the Gaussian distribution, and the Hawkes process is simulated using the Thinning algorithm (Ogata, 1981). We set the budget level parameter $\rho = 10$, and our results generalize beyond this value. We repeat simulation of the SDE for ten times and report average performance.

Total cost. Figure 2 (a) shows our method performs the best consistently. For LSOG, we set target opinion $a_i = 1$. The total cost per user measures the difference between each user's opinion and the target. We computed it by dividing the value function $V(\boldsymbol{x}_0, t_0)$ by # users. For OIM, there is no target state, and the goal is to maximize each user's positive opinion. Hence the larger the opinion, the better. We compute the total opinion per user by dividing the negative value function by # users. On both tasks, our method has around 2.5× improvement over CrossEntropy and 4× improvement over FiniteDifference, which are state-of-art reinforcement learning algorithms. CrossEntropy assumes the control is sampled from a



Figure 3: Robustness analysis when parameters are learned with different sample sizes. (a) and (b) instantaneous cost; (c) and (d) opinion trajectory for one randomly sample user.

Gaussian distribution, and FiniteDifference approximates the gradient. However, our method does not have such restriction on control policy or approximation of the gradient, and our policy exactly minimizes the cost. Hence it has the best performance.

Instantaneous cost & trajectory. Figure 2 (b) shows the instantaneous cost over time, which is computed by dividing the cost $\mathcal{L}$ in (15) by # users at each time. Our method converges to the optimal cost fastest and the cost is much lower than competitors at each time. Moreover, our method has the lowest variance and is quite stable despite multiple runs and the stochasticity in the SDE. (c) and (d) compare the opinion trajectories. The jumps in the opinion correspond to the opinion posting events that are modulated by the Hawkes process in the SDE. For LSOG, the opinion converges from initial value to target much faster. For OIM, our method maximizes the opinion from the negative initial value quickly: around time 2.5, all users' opinion are positive in (c), compared to time 5 in (d). Moreover, our method can achieve the largest opinion value, *e.g.*, 20, while that of CrossEntropy is less than 10.

Robustness. To guide the opinion dynamics, we need to learn the parameters of the opinion model. Typically error exists between estimated parameters and ground truth. To investigate how our framework performs with this discrepancy, we generate data with 10 and 100 opinion posting events per user, and learn parameters by maximum likelihood estimation, as in previous works (Iacus, 2009). Then we compare with CrossEntropy using both true and learned parameters, in terms of instantaneous cost and trajectory. Figure 3 (a) and (c) show that as the size of training data increases, the parameters are close to ground truth. More importantly, even with parameters learned with 10 and 100 events per user, our instantaneous cost and trajectories are close to these of ground-truth, indicating robustness our algorithm. (b) and (d) show that CrossEntropy has high variance due to inaccurate parameters.

Network visualization. Figure 4 visualizes effect of our policy that steers everyone's opinion to the opposite. We further conduct experiments with different choices of initial state and target state (Appendix G).

6.2 Experiments on Real-world Data

Experimental setup. We evaluate over two node birth networks. We focus on the least square opinion guiding task. *Twitter* Farajtabar et al. (2015) contains nearly 550,000 tweet, retweet and link creation events from around 280,000 users. We use all events from Sep. 21-30, 2012 and use the data before Sep. 21 to construct the initial social network. We consider the links created in the second 10-day period to be the node birth. *MemeTracker* Leskovec et al. (2009) contains online social media activities from August 2008 to April



(a) Opinion evolution (b) $t = 0$

(c) $t = 2$ (d) $t = 5$

Figure 4: Controlled opinion of 1000 users with $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ uniformly sampled from $[-10, 10]$ and sorted. The target state is polarized with -5 and 10. (a) opinion *value* per user over time; (b-d) snapshots of the opinion *polarity* in the network with 50 sub-users. Yellow/blue means positive/negative.

2009. Users track the posts of others and the network growth is captured by hyperlinks of comments on one site to others. In particular, we extract 11,321,362 posts among 5000 nodes. We use the data in Aug. 2008 to construct the initial network and use the LIWC (Pennebaker et al., 2015) toolbox to extract opinions from posts. We first learn the parameters of the opinion dynamics and the link creation process by maximizing the likelihood of observed data, as in previous works (Aalen et al., 2008; Iacus, 2009). For completeness, Appendix H and I contain detailed derivations.

We use two evaluation procedures. First, we now have a real network and parameters that are learned from data, and we simulate user behaviors and control over simulated behaviors. Hence we can evaluate the total cost of different policies. We set $\rho = 10$. However, the second and more interesting evaluation scheme would entail carrying real policy in a social platform. Since it is very challenging to evaluate on the real platform, we mimic such procedure using held-out data. The similar evaluation schemes have been successfully applied in (Farajtabar et al., 2014). More specifically, we partition the data into ten intervals and use one interval for training and others for testing. The procedure is as follows:

1. We estimate model parameters using data in interval 1.
2. Given the learned parameters, we compute the optimal policy and the optimal opinion trajectory $\boldsymbol{x}_i^*$, for all other intervals, $i = 2, \cdots, 10$. Then we sort the real opinion trajectory $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ according to the similarity to $\boldsymbol{x}_i^*$ using Euclidean distance $\|\boldsymbol{x}_i^* - \boldsymbol{x}_i\|$ in descending order.
3. Compute total cost on each of the other intervals and sort intervals according to total cost in descending order.
4. Finally we compute *prediction accuracy* by dividing the number of pairs with consistent ordering in step 2 and step 3 by total number of pairs.

In summary, the key idea is to predict which real trajectory reaches the objective better (has lower cost), by comparing it to the optimal trajectory $\boldsymbol{x}^*(t)$. Different methods yield different $\boldsymbol{x}^*(t)$, and the prediction accuracy depends on how optimal $\boldsymbol{x}^*(t)$ is. If it is optimal, it will be accurate if we use it to order the real trajectories, and the predicted list (step 2) should be similar to the ground truth (step 3), which is close to the accuracy of 1. We report prediction accuracy over ten runs by choosing each different interval for training once.

Total cost. Figure 5 (a) and (b) show that our method consistently performs the best for the two time-varying networks. In terms of total cost per user, it achieves around $6\times$ improvement on LSOG



(a) Total cost/opinion, Meme (b) Total cost/opinion, Twitter (c) Prediction, Meme (d) Prediction, Twitter

Figure 5: Experiments on least square guiding (LSOG) and influence maximization (OIM) over real node birth networks.



(a) Prediction on LSOG task (b) Prediction on OIM task

Figure 6: Prediction accuracy as a function of ρ on Twitter.

over CrossEntropy and 3× on OIM, compared with the 2.5× improvement for fixed networks. Hence controlling the SDE over time-varying networks is a challenging problem for traditional reinforcement learning algorithms. Moreover, the total costs of all methods for *Twitter* are higher than that of *Memetracker*. This is because *Twitter* has a much higher frequency of node birth, *i.e.*, users join the network in the timescale of minute-to-minute rather than day-to-day in *Memetracker*. Hence it is more challenging to control due to the high stochasticity in the network.

Prediction accuracy. Figure 5 (c) and (d) further show that our method performs the best. On both tasks and two networks, our method achieves more than 0.4+ improvement over CrossEntropy. It means that our method accommodates 40% more of the total realizations correctly. Accurate prediction means that if applying our control policy, we will achieve the objective better than alternatives. Moreover, the two reinforcement learning algorithms only achieve the accuracy around 30%, which means that their policies do not achieve the optimal cost as our method. Hence it is hard for these methods to succeed on time-varying networks.

Budget sensitivity. Figure 6 further shows our method performs best consistently as budget level decreases. Large value of the cost tradeoff parameter ρ means small budget.

7 Conclusions

We have proposed a novel SDE reformulation for user activity models and formalized the activity guiding problem, which builds a new bridge between "closed loop" guiding of user activities and stochastic optimal

control theory. Moreover, we have shown that it is important to incorporate the system status information to design a closed loop control policy, which will achieve a lower cost with faster speed. Our method also provides an efficient way to guide user activities over time-varying networks with link creation and node birth processes. There are many extensions we can imagine along this direction. For example, the jump term in the model can be extended to marked point processes (Jacobsen, 2006). We can also use nonlinear SDEs to model user activities.

References

Aalen, Odd, Borgan, Ornulf, and Gjessing, Hakon. *Survival and event history analysis: a process point of view*. Springer, 2008.

Chen, Wei, Wang, Yajun, and Yang, Siyu. Efficient influence maximization in social networks. In *KDD*, 2009.

Chen, Wei, Wang, Chi, and Wang, Yajun. Scalable influence maximization for prevalent viral marketing in large-scale social networks. In *KDD*, 2010a.

Chen, Wei, Yuan, Yifei, and Zhang, Li. Scalable influence maximization in social networks under the linear threshold model. In *ICDM*, 2010b.

Chen, Wei, Collins, Alex, Cummings, Rachel, Ke, Te, Liu, Zhenming, Rincon, David, Sun, Xiaorui, Wang, Yajun, Wei, Wei, and Yuan, Yifei. Influence maximization in social networks when negative opinions may emerge and propagate. In *SDM*, 2012.

Daley, D.J. and Vere-Jones, D. *An introduction to the theory of point processes: volume II: general theory and structure*, volume 2. Springer, 2007.

De, Abir, Valera, Isabel, Ganguly, Niloy, Bhattacharya, Sourangshu, and Rodriguez, Manuel Gomez. Learning opinion dynamics in social networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.05474*, 2015.

Dormand, John R and Prince, Peter J. A family of embedded runge-kutta formulae. *Journal of computational and applied mathematics*, 6(1):19–26, 1980.

Du, N., Song, L., Woo, H., and Zha, H. Uncover topic-sensitive information diffusion networks. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2013a.

Du, Nan, Song, Le, Gomez-Rodriguez, Manuel, and Zha, Hongyuan. Scalable influence estimation in continuous-time diffusion networks. In *NIPS*, 2013b.

Du, Nan, Wang, Yichen, He, Niao, and Song, Le. Time sensitive recommendation from recurrent user activities. In *NIPS*, 2015.

Epanchin-Niell, Rebecca S and Wilen, James E. Optimal spatial control of biological invasions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 63(2):260–270, 2012.

Farajtabar, Mehrdad, Du, Nan, Gomez-Rodriguez, Manuel, Valera, Isabel, Zha, Hongyuan, and Song, Le. Shaping social activity by incentivizing users. In *NIPS*, 2014.

Farajtabar, Mehrdad, Wang, Yichen, Gomez-Rodriguez, Manuel, Li, Shuang, Zha, Hongyuan, and Song, Le. Coevolve: A joint point process model for information diffusion and network co-evolution. In *NIPS*, 2015.

Grover, Aditya and Leskovec, Jure. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *KDD*, 2016.

Hanson, Floyd B. *Applied stochastic processes and control for Jump-diffusions: modeling, analysis, and computation*, volume 13. Siam, 2007.

Hawkes, Alan G. Spectra of some self-exciting and mutually exciting point processes. *Biometrika*, 58(1): 83–90, 1971.

He, Xinran and Liu, Yan. Not enough data?: Joint inferring multiple diffusion networks via network generation priors. In *WSDM*, 2017.

He, Xinran, Rekatsinas, Theodoros, Foulds, James, Getoor, Lise, and Liu, Yan. Hawkestopic: A joint model for network inference and topic modeling from text-based cascades. In *ICML*, pp. 871–880, 2015.

Iacus, Stefano M. *Simulation and inference for stochastic differential equations: with R examples*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

Jacobsen, Martin. *Point process theory and applications*. Springer, 2006.

Kempe, David, Kleinberg, Jon, and Tardos, Éva. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *SIGKDD*, pp. 137–146. ACM, 2003.

Leskovec, J., Backstrom, L., and Kleinberg, J. Meme-tracking and the dynamics of the news cycle. In *KDD*, 2009.

Nowzari, Cameron, Preciado, Victor M, and Pappas, George J. Analysis and control of epidemics: A survey of spreading processes on complex networks. *IEEE Control Systems*, 2016.

Ogata, Yosihiko. On lewis' simulation method for point processes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 27(1):23–31, 1981.

Oksendal, Bernt Karsten and Sulem, Agnes. *Applied stochastic control of jump diffusions*, volume 498. Springer, 2005.

Pastor-Satorras, Romualdo, Castellano, Claudio, Van Mieghem, Piet, and Vespignani, Alessandro. Epidemic processes in complex networks. *Reviews of modern physics*, 87(3):925, 2015.

Pennebaker, James W, Boyd, Ryan L, Jordan, Kayla, and Blackburn, Kate. The development and psychometric properties of liwc2015. *UT Faculty/Researcher Works*, 2015.

Peters, Jan and Schaal, Stefan. Policy gradient methods for robotics. In *Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2006 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*. IEEE, 2006.

Rodriguez, Manuel, Leskovec, Jure, et al. Modeling information propagation with survival theory. In *ICML*, pp. 666–674, 2013.

Schmidt, M., van den Berg, E., Friedlander, M. P., and Murphy, K. Optimizing costly functions with simple constraints: A limited-memory projected quasi-newton algorithm. In *AISTAT*, 2009.

Stulp, Freek and Sigaud, Olivier. Path integral policy improvement with covariance matrix adaptation. In *ICML*, 2012.

Wang, Xin, Donaldson, Roger, Nell, Christopher, Gorniak, Peter, Ester, Martin, and Bu, Jiajun. Recommending groups to users using user-group engagement and time-dependent matrix factorization. In *AAAI*, 2016a.

Wang, Yichen, Du, Nan, Trivedi, Rakshit, and Song, Le. Coevolutionary latent feature processes for continuous-time user-item interactions. In *NIPS*, 2016b.

Wang, Yichen, Xie, Bo, Du, Nan, and Song, Le. Isotonic hawkes processes. In *ICML*, 2016c.

Zhao, Qingyuan, Erdogdu, Murat A., He, Hera Y., Rajaraman, Anand, and Leskovec, Jure. Seismic: A self-exciting point process model for predicting tweet popularity. In *KDD*, 2015.

Zhou, Ke, Zha, Hongyuan, and Song, Le. Learning social infectivity in sparse low-rank networks using multi-dimensional hawkes processes. In *AISTAT*, 2013.

A Proof of Theorem 2

We first define the convolution operator $\star$ of any two function $f(t)$ and $g(t)$ is defined as:

$$f(t) \star g(t) = \int_0^t f(t-s)g(s)\mathrm{d}s \tag{25}$$

Therefore, the equation for $x_i(t)$ can be expressed as:

$$x_i(t) = \underset{\text{base}}{b_i(t)} + \underbrace{\sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij}\kappa_{\omega_2}(t) \star \big(h(x_j(t))\mathrm{d}N_j(t)\big)}_{\text{social neighbor influence}} \tag{26}$$

Next, we will apply the differential operator d to $x_i(t)$, and we need the following two properties:

- $\mathrm{d}\kappa_{\omega_2}(t) = -\omega_2\kappa_{\omega_2}(t)\mathrm{d}t$ for $t \geqslant 0$ and $\kappa_{\omega_2}(0) = 1$.
- The differential of the convolution of two functions is: $\mathrm{d}(f \star g) = f(0)g + g \star \mathrm{d}f$.

Set $f = \kappa_{\omega_2}(t)$, and $g = \sum_j \alpha_{ij}h(x_j)\mathrm{d}N_j(t)$, then take the differential of $x_i(t)$ and use the above two properties, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}x_i(t) &= \mathrm{d}b_i(t) + \mathrm{d}(f \star g) && (27)\\
&= \mathrm{d}b_i(t) + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij}h(x_j)\mathrm{d}N_j(t) - \omega_2\Big(\sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij}k_{\omega_2}(t) \star (h(x_j)\cdot \mathrm{d}N_j(t))\Big)\mathrm{d}t && (28)\\
&= \mathrm{d}b_i(t) + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij}h(x_j)\mathrm{d}N_j(t) - \omega_2(x_i(t) - b_i(t))\mathrm{d}t && (29)\\
&= \mathrm{d}b_i(t) + \omega_2(b_i(t) - x_i(t))\mathrm{d}t + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij}h(x_j(t))\mathrm{d}N_j(t) && (30)
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof for (9). Similarly, we can express the intensity using the convolution operator:

$$\lambda_i(t) = \underset{\text{base}}{\eta_i(t)} + \underbrace{\sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij}\kappa_{\omega_1}(t) \star \mathrm{d}N_j(t)}_{\text{social neighbor influence}} \tag{31}$$

Then we set $f = \kappa_{\omega_1}(t)$, $g = \sum_j \alpha_{ij}\mathrm{d}N_j(t)$, and can show the following equation:

$$\mathrm{d}\lambda_i(t) = \mathrm{d}\eta_i(t) + \omega_1\big(\eta_i(t) - \lambda_i(t)\big)\mathrm{d}t + \sum\nolimits_j \beta_{ij}\mathrm{d}N_j(t) \tag{32}$$

This completes the proof.

B Proof of Theorem 4

Theorem 4 (Generalize Ito Lemma)**.** *Given the SDE in (13), let $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ be a twice-differentiable function in $\boldsymbol{x}$ and once in t, then we have:*

$$\mathrm{d}V = \Big\{V_t + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^\top) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\Big\}\mathrm{d}t + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w} + \big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}, t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) \tag{33}$$

To prove the theorem, we will first provide some background and useful formulas as follows.

$$(\mathrm{d}t)^2 = 0, \mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) = 0, \mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t) = 0, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) = 0, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)^\top = \mathrm{d}t\boldsymbol{I} \tag{34}$$

All the above equations hold in the *mean square limit* sense. The mean square limit definition enables us to extend the calculus rules for deterministic functions and properly define stochastic calculus rules such as stochastic differential and stochastic integration for stochastic processes. See Hanson (2007) for the proof of these equations. In the proof below, we will directly acknowledge and use these equations.

Proof. We first restate the SDE in (13) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} &= \big(\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{u}\big)\mathrm{d}t + \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t) + \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) &(35)\\ &= \boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) &(36)\end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \big(\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \boldsymbol{u}\big)\mathrm{d}t + \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)$$

Hence, $\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x})$ denotes the continuous part of the SDE, while $\boldsymbol{h}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)$ denotes the discontinuous part. For notation simplicity we set $\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{h}$ and omit the dependency on $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Next, we expand $\mathrm{d}V$ according to its definition:

$$\mathrm{d}V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t), t+\mathrm{d}t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) \tag{37}$$

With the definition $\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t) = \boldsymbol{x}(t) + \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}$, we can further expand $V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t), t+\mathrm{d}t)$ using Taylor expansion on variable t as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t), t+\mathrm{d}t) &= V(\boldsymbol{x}+\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, t+\mathrm{d}t) &(38)\\ &= V(\boldsymbol{x}+\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, t) + V_t(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\mathrm{d}t &(39)\end{aligned}$$

Next, we expand $V(\boldsymbol{x}+\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}&V(\boldsymbol{x}+\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}, t)\\ &= V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F}+\boldsymbol{h}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t), t) &(40)\\ &= \Big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F}+\boldsymbol{h}, t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F}, t)\Big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) + V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F}, t) &(41)\\ &= \Bigg[\underbrace{V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}, t) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})^\top\boldsymbol{F} + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})\boldsymbol{F}^\top}_{\text{Taylor expansion 1}} - \Big(\underbrace{V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{F} + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{F}^\top}_{\text{Taylor expansion 2}}\Big)\Bigg]\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) &(42)\\ &\quad + \underbrace{V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{F} + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{F}^\top}_{\text{Taylor expansion 2}} &(43)\\ &= \Big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}, t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\Big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) + \Big(V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}) - V_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Big)^\top\boldsymbol{F}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) &(44)\\ &\quad + V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{F} + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{F}^\top + \Big(\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})\boldsymbol{F}^\top - \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{F}^\top\Big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) &(45)\end{aligned}$$

Next, we show the reasoning from (40) to (43). First, since $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) \in \{0, 1\}$, there are two cases for (40). If jump happens, *i.e.*, $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) = 1$, then (40) is equivalent to $V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x})+\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x}), t)$. If there is no jump, *i.e.*, $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) = 0$, (40) is equivalent to $V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F}(\boldsymbol{x}), t)$. Hence (41) is equivalent to (40).

Second, from (41) to (43), we have used the following Taylor expansions.

Taylor expansion 1. For $V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F}+\boldsymbol{h},t)$, we expand it around $V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h},t)$ on the $\boldsymbol{x}$-dimension:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F}+\boldsymbol{h},t)=V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h},t)+V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})^{\top}\boldsymbol{F}+\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})\boldsymbol{F}^{\top}$$

Taylor expansion 2. For $V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F},t)$, we expand it around $V(\boldsymbol{x},t)$ along the $\boldsymbol{x}$ dimension:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{F},t)=V(\boldsymbol{x},t)+V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{F}+\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{F}^{\top}$$

Next, we simplify each term in (44) and (45). We keep the first term and expand the second term, $\Big(V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})-V_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Big)^{\top}\boldsymbol{F}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})-V_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Big)^{\top}\boldsymbol{F}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)&=\Big(V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})-V_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Big)^{\top}((\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\mathrm{d}t+\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t))\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)\\&=\Big(V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})-V_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Big)^{\top}\Big((\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)+\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)\Big),\\&=0\end{aligned}\tag{46}$$

where we have used the equations: $\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)=0$ and $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)=0$ in the Ito mean square limit sense from (34).

We keep the third term and expand the fourth term, $V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{F}$, as:

$$V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{F}=V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\mathrm{d}t+V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\tag{47}$$

The fifth term, $\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{F}^{\top}$, is expanded as:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{F}^{\top}&=\frac{1}{2}\Big((\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\mathrm{d}t+\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\Big)V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\Big((\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\mathrm{d}t+\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\Big)^{\top}\\&=\frac{1}{2}\Big((\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})^{\top}(\mathrm{d}t)^2+2(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\mathrm{d}tV_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t))^{\top}+(\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t))V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t))^{\top}\Big)\\&=\frac{1}{2}\Big(0+0+\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^{\top})\mathrm{d}t\Big)\\&=\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^{\top})\mathrm{d}t,\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

where we have used the property that $(\mathrm{d}t)^2=0$, $\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}=0$, and $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)^{\top}=\mathrm{d}t\boldsymbol{I}$ from (34).

Finally, the last term is expressed as:

$$\Big(\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})\boldsymbol{F}^{\top}-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{F}V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x})\boldsymbol{F}^{\top}\Big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)=\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h})\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^{\top})\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^{\top})\mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)=0-0=0\tag{49}$$

Substituting (46), (47), (48), and (49) to (44) and (45), we have:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}+\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x},t)=\Big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h},t)-V(\boldsymbol{x},t)\Big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)+V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\mathrm{d}t+V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)+V(\boldsymbol{x},t)+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^{\top})\mathrm{d}t\tag{50}$$

Plugging (50) to (39), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t),t+\mathrm{d}t)=&\Big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h},t)-V(\boldsymbol{x},t)\Big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)+V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\mathrm{d}t+V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t)\\&+V(\boldsymbol{x},t)+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^{\top})\mathrm{d}t+V_t(\boldsymbol{x},t)\mathrm{d}t\end{aligned}$$

Hence after simplification, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}V &= V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t), t+\mathrm{d}t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}(t), t) \\ &= \Big\{V_t + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^\top) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\Big\}\mathrm{d}t + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w} + \big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}, t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

C Proof of Theorem 5

Theorem 5. *The HJB equation for the Information Guiding Problem in (15) is:*

$$-V_t = \min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \Big[\mathcal{L} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\big(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^\top\big) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u}) + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \lambda_j(t)\big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}),t) - V(\boldsymbol{x},t)\big)\Big] \tag{51}$$

where $\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x})$ is the j-th column of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x})$.

Proof. First, similar to the deterministic case in (16), the value function V can be written as:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x},t) \tag{52}$$

$$= \min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \mathbb{E}\Big[V(\boldsymbol{x}(t+\mathrm{d}t), t+\mathrm{d}t) + \int_t^{t+\mathrm{d}t} \mathcal{L}\,\mathrm{d}\tau\Big] \tag{53}$$

$$= \min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \mathbb{E}\Big[V(\boldsymbol{x},t) + \mathrm{d}V + \mathcal{L}\,\mathrm{d}t\Big] \tag{54}$$

$$= \min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \mathbb{E}\Big[V(\boldsymbol{x},t) + \Big\{V_t + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^\top) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\Big\}\mathrm{d}t + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{g}\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w} + \big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h},t) - V(\boldsymbol{x},t)\big)\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) + \mathcal{L}\,\mathrm{d}t\Big] \tag{55}$$

$$= \min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \Big[V(\boldsymbol{x},t) + \Big\{V_t + \mathcal{L} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\big(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}\boldsymbol{g}\boldsymbol{g}^\top\big) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top(\boldsymbol{f}+\boldsymbol{u})\Big\}\mathrm{d}t + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \lambda_j(t)\big(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}),t) - V(\boldsymbol{x},t)\big)\mathrm{d}t\Big] \tag{56}$$

where (54) to (55) follows from Theorem 4. (55) to (56) follows from the properties of Wiener process and Point process: $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t)] = \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)\mathrm{d}t$.

Finally, we cancel $V(\boldsymbol{x},t)$ on both sides of (56) and divide both sides by $\mathrm{d}t$. This yields (51).

D Proof of Proposition 6

For the quadratic cost case, *i.e.*, the opinion least square guiding problem, we have: $\phi = \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{x}(T) - \boldsymbol{a}\|^2$, $\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{x}(t) - \boldsymbol{a}\|^2 + \frac{\rho}{2}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^2$. Since the instantaneous cost $\mathcal{L}$ is quadratic in $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$, and terminal cost ϕ is quadratic in $\boldsymbol{x}$, if the control $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a linear function of $\boldsymbol{x}$, then the value function V must be quadratic in $\boldsymbol{x}$, since it is the optimal value of the summation of quadratic functions.

Moreover, the fact that $\boldsymbol{u}$ is linear in $\boldsymbol{x}$ is because our SDE model for information diffusion is linear in both $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$. Since $V(T) = \phi(T)$ is quadratic, as illustrated in Hanson (2007), one can show by induction that when computing the value of V backward in time, $\boldsymbol{u}$ is always linear in $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Similarly, one can show for the opinion maximization cost, *i.e.*, $\phi = -\sum_u x_u(T)$, $\mathcal{L} = -\sum_u x_u(t) + \frac{\rho}{2}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^2$, the value function V is linear in the state $\boldsymbol{x}$.

E Optimal Control Policy for Least Square Opinion Guiding

In this section, we will provide detailed derivations of the optimal control policy for the opinion SDE defined in (14) with the least square opinion guiding cost. First, we choose $\omega = 1$ and restate the controlled SDE in (14) as follows.

$$\mathrm{d}x_i(t) = \big(b_i + u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) - x_i(t)\big)\mathrm{d}t + \beta \mathrm{d}w_i(t) + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij} x_j(t) \mathrm{d}N_j(t)$$

Putting it in the vector form, we have:

$$\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}(t) = \big(\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{u}\big)\mathrm{d}t + \beta \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t) + \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) \tag{57}$$

where the j-th column of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x})$ captures how much influence that x_j has on all other users and is defined as $\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{B}^j \boldsymbol{x}$, where the matrix $\boldsymbol{B}^j \in \Re^{U \times U}$ and has the j-th column to be $(\alpha_{1j}, \cdots, \alpha_{Uj})^\top$ and zero elsewhere. We substitute $f = \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{x}(t) + \boldsymbol{u}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{g} = \beta$ and $\boldsymbol{h}$ to (18) and obtain the HJB equation as:

$$-\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} = \min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \Big\{ \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, t) + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \mathrm{tr}\big(V_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t)^\top (\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{x}(t) + \boldsymbol{u}(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{U} \lambda_j(t) \big(V(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}), t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big) \Big\} \tag{58}$$

For the least square guiding problem, the instantaneous and terminal cost are defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, t) = \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{a}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2, \qquad \phi(T) = \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{x}(T) - \boldsymbol{a}\|^2 \tag{59}$$

Hence we assume that value function V is quadratic in $\boldsymbol{x}$ with unknown coefficients $\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) \in \Re^U$, $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t) \in \Re^{U \times U}$ and $v_0(t) \in \Re$:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = v_0(t) + \boldsymbol{v}_1(t)^\top \boldsymbol{x} + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t) \boldsymbol{x} \tag{60}$$

To find the optimal control, we substitute (60) to HJB equation and take the gradient of the right-hand side of the HJB equation (58) with respect to $\boldsymbol{u}$ and set it to $\boldsymbol{0}$. This yields the optimal feedback control policy:

$$\boldsymbol{u}^*(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = -\frac{1}{\rho} V_{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\Big(\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) + \boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\boldsymbol{x}\Big) \tag{61}$$

Substitute $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ in (21) to the HJB equation, we first compute the four terms on the right side of the HJB equation. Note that the minimization is reached when $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u}^*$. In the following computation, we will use the property that $\boldsymbol{v}_{11} = \boldsymbol{v}_{11}^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{a}^\top \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{b}^\top \boldsymbol{a}$ for any vector $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{b}$.

The first term is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}^*, t) &= \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{a} + \frac{1}{2}\rho \boldsymbol{u}^{*\top} \boldsymbol{u}^* \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{a} + \frac{1}{2\rho}(\boldsymbol{v}_1 + \boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x})^\top (\boldsymbol{v}_1 + \boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{a} + \frac{1}{2\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1 + \frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top \boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x} + \frac{1}{2\rho}\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x} \\
&= \underbrace{\frac{1}{2\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1}_{\text{scalar}} + \underbrace{\boldsymbol{x}^\top (\frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{a})}_{\text{linear}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top (\frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{v}_{11} + \boldsymbol{I})\boldsymbol{x}}_{\text{quadratic}}
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Note that in line 1 of the expansion of $\mathcal{L}$, we dropped the constant term $\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{a}^\top \boldsymbol{a}$.

The second term is a scalar: $\mathrm{tr}\big(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x},t) = \frac{\beta^2}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{v}_{11})$. The third term is:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top(\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{u}^*) &= (\boldsymbol{v}_1+\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x})^\top(\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{u}^*) = (\boldsymbol{v}_1+\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x})^\top(\boldsymbol{b}-\boldsymbol{x}-\frac{1}{\rho}(\boldsymbol{v}_1+\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x})) \\ &= (\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top\boldsymbol{b}-\frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top\boldsymbol{v}_1) - (\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top\boldsymbol{x}+\frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x}+\frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{b}^\top\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{v}_{11}^\top\boldsymbol{x} - \frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{v}_{11}^\top\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{x} \\ &= \underbrace{(\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top\boldsymbol{b}-\frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top\boldsymbol{v}_1)}_{\text{scalar}} - \underbrace{\boldsymbol{x}^\top(\boldsymbol{v}_1+\frac{2}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{v}_1-\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{b})}_{\text{linear}} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top(2\boldsymbol{v}_{11}+\frac{2}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{v}_{11})\boldsymbol{x}}_{\text{quadratic}} \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

The fourth term is:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^U \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(t)(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}),t)-V(\boldsymbol{x},t)) &= \sum_{j=1}^U \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(t)(\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top\boldsymbol{B}^j\boldsymbol{x}+\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{B}^{j\top}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{B}^j\boldsymbol{x}+\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top 2\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{B}^j\boldsymbol{x}) \\ &= \underbrace{\boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\top\boldsymbol{v}_1}_{\text{linear}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top(\sum_{j=1}^U \lambda_j\boldsymbol{B}^{j\top}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{B}^j+2\boldsymbol{v}_{11}\boldsymbol{\Lambda})\boldsymbol{x}}_{\text{quadratic}} \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^U \lambda_j(t)\boldsymbol{B}^j$. Next, we compute the left side of HJB equation as:

$$-V_t = -v_0'(t) - \boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{v}_1'(t) - \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{v}_{11}'(t)\boldsymbol{x} \tag{65}$$

Then by comparing the coefficients for the scalar, linear and quadratic terms in both left-hand-side and right-hand-side of the HJB equation, we obtain three ODEs.

First, only consider all the coefficients quadratic in $\boldsymbol{x}$:

$$-\boldsymbol{v}_{11}'(t) = \boldsymbol{I} + 2\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)(-1+\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^U \lambda_j(t)\boldsymbol{B}^{j\top}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\boldsymbol{B}^j - \frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t) \tag{66}$$

Second, consider the linear term:

$$-\boldsymbol{v}_1'(t) = -\boldsymbol{a} + (-1+\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\top(t) - \frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t))\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) + \boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)\boldsymbol{b} \tag{67}$$

Third, consider the scalar term:

$$-v_0'(t) = \boldsymbol{b}^\top\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) + \frac{\beta^2}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)) - \frac{1}{2\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top(t)\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) \tag{68}$$

Finally, we compute the terminal condition for the three ODEs by $V(\boldsymbol{x}(T),T) = \phi(\boldsymbol{x}(T),T)$:

$$V(X(T),T) = v_0(T) + \boldsymbol{x}(T)^\top\boldsymbol{v}_1(T) + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}(T)^\top\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(T)\boldsymbol{x}(T) \tag{69}$$

$$\phi(\boldsymbol{x}(T),T) = -\boldsymbol{x}(T)^\top\boldsymbol{a} + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{x}(T)^\top\boldsymbol{x}(T) \tag{70}$$

Hence $v_0(T) = 0$, $\boldsymbol{v}_1(T) = -\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_{11} = \boldsymbol{I}$. Note here we drop the constant term $\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{a}^\top\boldsymbol{a}$ in terminal cost ϕ.

Finally, we just need to use Algorithm 1 to solve the ODEs in (66) and (67) to obtain $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_1(t)$. Substituting $\boldsymbol{v}_{11}, \boldsymbol{v}_1$ to (61) leads to the optimal control policy.

F Optimal Control Policy for Opinion Influence Maximization

We will provide the algorithm to solve the opinion influence maximization problem. The solving scheme is similar to the least square opinion shaping cost. The exact form of derivation is different due to the difference cost functions.

First, we choose $\omega = 1$ and restate the controlled opinion SDE in (14) as:

$$\mathrm{d}x_i(t) = \big(b_i + u_i(\boldsymbol{x}, t) - x_i(t)\big)\mathrm{d}t + \beta \mathrm{d}w_i(t) + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij} x_j(t) \mathrm{d}N_j(t)$$

Putting it in the vector form, we have:

$$\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x}(t) = \big(\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{u}\big)\mathrm{d}t + \beta \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(t) + \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x})\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{N}(t) \tag{71}$$

where the j-th column of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x})$ captures how much influence that x_j has on all other users and is defined as $\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{B}^j \boldsymbol{x}$, where the matrix $\boldsymbol{B}^j \in \Re^{U \times U}$ and has the j-th column to be $(\alpha_{1j}, \cdots, \alpha_{Uj})^\top$ and zero elsewhere. We substitute $f = \boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{x}$, $\boldsymbol{g} = \beta$ and $\boldsymbol{h}$ to (18) and obtain the HJB equation as:

$$-\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} = \min_{\boldsymbol{u}} \Big\{ \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, t) + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \mathrm{tr}\big(V_{\boldsymbol{xx}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big) + V_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}, t)^\top (\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{x}(t) + \boldsymbol{u}(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^{U} \lambda_j(t) \big(V(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}), t) - V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)\big) \Big\} \tag{72}$$

For opinion influence maximization, we define the cost as follows. Suppose the goal is to maximize the opinion influence at each time on $[0, T]$, the instantaneous cost $\mathcal{L}$ is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}, t) = -\sum_{j=1}^{U} x_i(t) + \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^2 = -\boldsymbol{x}(t)^\top \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^2$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the column vector with each entry to be one. For the terminal cost, we have: $\phi(T) = -\boldsymbol{x}(T)^\top \mathbf{1}$.

Following the similar reasoning as the least square opinion guiding problem. Since the terminal cost ϕ is linear in the state $\boldsymbol{x}$, the value function must be linear in $\boldsymbol{x}$, since it is the optimal value of a linear function. Hence we set the value function $V(\boldsymbol{x}, t)$ to be a linear function in $\boldsymbol{x}$ with *unknown coefficients* $\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) \in \Re^U$ and $v_0(t) \in \Re$:

$$V(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = v_0(t) + \boldsymbol{v}_1(t)^\top \boldsymbol{x} \tag{73}$$

To find the optimal control, we substitute (73) to (72) and take the gradient of the right-hand-side of (72) with respect to $\boldsymbol{u}$ and set it to $\mathbf{0}$. This yields the optimal control policy:

$$\boldsymbol{u}^*(t) = -\frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1(t) \tag{74}$$

Next, we just need to compute $\boldsymbol{v}_1(t)$ to find $\boldsymbol{u}^*$. Substitute $\boldsymbol{u}^*$ in (74) to the HJB equation, we will compute the four terms on the right side of the HJB equation and derive the ODEs by comparing the coefficients. Note that the minimization is reached when $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u}^*$.

First, $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}^*, t)$ is expanded as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}^*, t) = -\boldsymbol{x}^\top \mathbf{1} + \frac{1}{2}\|\boldsymbol{u}^*\|^2 = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1}_{\text{scalar}} - \underbrace{\boldsymbol{x}^\top \mathbf{1}}_{\text{linear}} \tag{75}$$

Since V is linear in $\boldsymbol{x}$, $V_{\boldsymbol{xx}} = 0$. The third term is:

$$V_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top (\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{u}^*) = \boldsymbol{v}_1^\top (\boldsymbol{b} - \boldsymbol{x} - \frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1) = \underbrace{\boldsymbol{v}^\top \boldsymbol{b} - \frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1}_{\text{scalar}} - \underbrace{\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1}_{\text{linear}} \tag{76}$$

The fourth term is:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{U} \lambda_j(t)(V(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}),t)-V(\boldsymbol{x},t)) = \sum_{j=1}^{U} \lambda_j(t)\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top \boldsymbol{h}_j(\boldsymbol{x}) = \underbrace{\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1}_{\text{linear}} \tag{77}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{U} \lambda_j(t)\boldsymbol{B}^j$. Next, we compute the left-hand-side of HJB equation as:

$$-V_t = -v_0'(t) - \boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1'(t) \tag{78}$$

Then by comparing the coefficients for the scalar and linear terms in both left side and right side of the HJB equation, we obtain two ODEs.

First, only consider all the coefficients linear in $\boldsymbol{x}$:

$$\boldsymbol{v}_1'(t) = \mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{v}_1(t) - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1(t) \tag{79}$$

Second, consider the linear term:

$$v_0'(t) = -\frac{1}{2\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{v}_1^\top \boldsymbol{b} + \frac{1}{\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1 = -\boldsymbol{v}_1(t)^\top \boldsymbol{b} + \frac{1}{2\rho}\boldsymbol{v}_1(t)^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1(t) \tag{80}$$

Hence we just need to solve the ODEs (78) to obtain $\boldsymbol{v}_1$ and then compute the optimal control $\boldsymbol{u}^*(t)$ from (74).

Finally we derive the terminal conditions for the above two ordinary differential equations. First, $V(T) = \phi(T) = -\boldsymbol{x}(T)^\top \mathbf{1}$ holds from the definition of the value function. Moreover, from the function form of V, we have $= v_0(T) + \boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1(T)$. Hence by comparing the coefficients, we have $v_0(T) = 0$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_1(T) = -\mathbf{1}$.

With the above terminal condition and (79), we will use Algorithm 1 to solve for $\boldsymbol{v}_1(t)$ and obtain the optimal control policy.

G Additional Experiments

G.1 Synthetic Experiments

Synthetic experimental setup. We consider a network with 1000 users and simulate the opinion SDE on the observation window $[0, 10]$ by applying Euler forward method to compute the difference form of (14) with $\omega = 1$:

$$x_i(t_{k+1}) = x_i(t_k) + \big(b_i + u_i(t_k) - x_i(t_k)\big)\Delta t + \beta \Delta w_i(t_k) + \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{U} \alpha_{ij} x_j(t_k) \Delta N_j(t_k)$$

where the observation window is divided into 100 time stamps $\{t_k\}$, with interval $\Delta t = 0.1$. The Wiener increments Δw_i is sampled from the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sqrt{\Delta t})$ and the Hawkes increments $\Delta N_j(t_k)$ is computed by counting the number of events on $[t_k, t_{k+1})$ for user j. The events for each user is simulated by the Otaga's thinning algorithm Ogata (1981). The thinning algorithm is essentially a rejection sampling algorithm where samples are first proposed from a homogeneous Poisson process and then samples are kept according to the ratio between the actual intensity and that of the Poisson process. We set the baseline opinion uniformly at random, $b_i \sim \mathcal{U}[-1, 1]$, noise level $\beta = 0.2$, adjacency matrix (α_{ij}) with sparsity of 0.001 and $\alpha_{ij} \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 0.01]$, initial opinion $x_i(0) = -10$, and $\omega = 1$ for the exponential triggering kernel κ_ω. We repeat simulation of the SDE for ten times and report average performance. We set the tradeoff (budget level) parameter $\rho = 10$, and our results generalize beyond this value.

Network visualization. We conduct control over four 1000-user networks with different initial and target states. Figure 7 shows our framework works efficiently.



Figure 7: Controlled opinion of four networks with 1,000 users. The first column is the description of opinion change. The second column shows the opinion *value* per user over time. The three right columns show three snapshots of the opinion *polarity* in the network with 50 sub-users at different times. Yellow means positive and blue means negative polarity. Since the controlled trajectory converges fast, we use time range of $[0, 5]$. Parameters are same except for different initial and target state: Set index I to denote user 1-500 and II to denote the rest. 1st row: $\boldsymbol{x}_0 = -10, \boldsymbol{a} = 10$. 2nd row: $\boldsymbol{x}_0 = -10, \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{I}) = -5, \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{II}) = 10$. 3rd row: $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ sampled uniformly from $[-10, 10]$ and sorted in decreasing order, $\boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{I}) = -10, \boldsymbol{a}(\mathrm{II}) = 5$. 4th row: $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ is same as (c), $\boldsymbol{a} = 10$.

G.2 Real-World Experiments

Trajectory visualization. Figure 8 shows our method can steer the opinion of the user once he joins the network. In *Twitter*, user6-8 join the network sequentially. First, user6 joins around the 16th minute. Before this time, his opinion is not controlled. He creates a link to user2, since there is an immediate drop in the opinion of user2. Next, user7 joins and connects to user6 around the 22nd minute and the opinion of user6 drops due to the negative influence of user7. Finally our framework steers their opinions to target state quickly.



(a) Memetracker (b) Twitter

Figure 8: Experiments on node birth networks on LSOG task. Opinion trajectories of eight randomly sampled users by our method. Four users are in the network and other four join sequentially. Time unit is *day* for Meme and *minute* for Twitter.

H Parameter Estimation for Opinion Dynamics

To control the opinion dynamics, we first need to learn the parameters of the uncontrolled dynamics in (14). In this section, we present the efficient framework convex parameter learning. There are two sets of parameters: i) $\{\boldsymbol{b}, \beta\}$ are the coefficients of drift and diffusion processes in (14), and ii) $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{A}\}$ are the coefficients of jump process, *i.e.*, the Hawkes process. The observed data is in the form of $\mathcal{T} = \{(t_i, x_{v_i}, v_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. Each triplet means user v_i posts his opinion x_{v_i} at time t_i in the network.

Now we introduce our learning framework. Following the derivation for Vasicek process (Iacus, 2009), a classic diffusion SDE that is similar to (14) but without the jump term. we will compute the marginal conditional density $p(x_{v_{i+1}}|x_{v_i})$ for each sample (t_i, x_{v_i}, v_i). In order to so, we first derive the close form solution of $\boldsymbol{x}(t_{i+1})$ given $\boldsymbol{x}(t_i)$ and obtain Gaussian conditional density:

Gaussian conditional density. Set $V(x,t) = x\exp(t)$, apply the Generalized Ito's lemma in Theorem 4, and integrate the opinion dynamics (14) on $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$, then we have

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t_{i+1}) = \underbrace{\boldsymbol{b} + (\boldsymbol{x}(t_i) - \boldsymbol{b})\exp(-\Delta_i)}_{\text{drift}} + \underbrace{\beta \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \exp(-(t_{i+1} - s))\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(s)}_{\text{diffusion}}$$
$$+ \underbrace{\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x}(t_i))(\boldsymbol{N}(t_{i+1}) - \boldsymbol{N}(t_i))\exp(\Delta_i)}_{\text{jump}}$$

where $\Delta_i = t_{i+1} - t_i$. From the conditional law (Iacus, 2009), since $\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{w}(s)$ follows Gaussian distribution, we can see $\boldsymbol{x}(t_i)$ has the Gaussian conditional density with mean to be the sum of drift and jump term, and variance to be integral of the diffusion:

$$\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{x}(t_{i+1})|\boldsymbol{x}(t_i)] = \boldsymbol{b} + (\boldsymbol{x}(t_i) - \boldsymbol{b})\exp(-\Delta_i) + \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x}(t_i))(\boldsymbol{N}(t_{i+1}) - \boldsymbol{N}(t_i))\exp(\Delta_i) \tag{81}$$
$$\mathrm{Var}[\boldsymbol{x}(t_{i+1})|\boldsymbol{x}(t_i)] = \beta^2(1 - \exp(-2\Delta_i))\boldsymbol{I} \tag{82}$$

Next, we derive the marginal density of the above conditional Gaussian distribution at dimension v_{i+1}. Since only one event happened at time t_{i+1} to user v_{i+1}, the counting difference vector $\boldsymbol{N}(t_{i+1}) - \boldsymbol{N}(t_i)$ has value 1 at the v_{i+1}-th dimension and zero elsewhere.

Hence the v_{i+1}-th dimension of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{x}(t_i))(\boldsymbol{N}(t_{i+1}) - \boldsymbol{N}(t_i))$ is $\boldsymbol{A}(v_i, v_{i+1})x_{v_i}$, where $\boldsymbol{A}$ is the network adjacency matrix. Substitute it to (81), we have marginal conditional density as:

$$\mathbb{E}[x_{v_{i+1}}|x_{v_i}] = b_{v_i} + (x_{v_i} - b_{v_i})\exp(-\Delta_i) + \boldsymbol{A}(v_i, v_{i+1})x_{v_i}$$
$$\mathrm{Var}[x_{v_{i+1}}|x_{v_i}] = \beta^2(1 - \exp(-2\Delta_i))$$

With these two sufficient statistics, we can compute $p(x_{v_{i+1}}|x_{v_i})$ from these two statistics since it is a conditional Gaussian density.

Point process likelihood. Having computed the probability for opinion transition from $\boldsymbol{x}_{v_i}$ to $\boldsymbol{x}_{v_{i+1}}$, now we compute the probability that this opinion happens at v_{i+1} at t_{i+1} and no event happens between t_i and t_{i+1} from theory of survival analysis (Aalen et al., 2008):

$$P(N_{v_{i+1}}(t_{i+1}) - N_{v_{i+1}}(t_i) = 1) = \lambda_{v_{i+1}}(t_{i+1}) \prod_{v=1}^{U} \exp\Big(-\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \lambda_v(t)\mathrm{d}t\Big)$$

Finally, combining the Gaussian conditional density and the point process likelihood, the complete likelihood function for all samples is:

$$\ell(\mathcal{T}) = \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^{n} p(x_{v_{i+1}}|x_{v_i})}_{\text{Gaussian density}} \underbrace{\lambda_{v_i}(t_i) \prod_{v=1}^{U} \exp\Big(-\int_0^T \lambda_v(t)\mathrm{d}t\Big)}_{\text{point process likelihood}}$$

For Hawkes process, we parametrize $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)$ in (6). The parameters can be estimated by maximizing the likelihood, *i.e.*, $\max_{\boldsymbol{A}\geqslant\mathbf{0},\boldsymbol{\eta}\geqslant\mathbf{0},\beta\geqslant 0,\boldsymbol{b}} \ell(\mathcal{T})$.

We can see the likelihood function is nicely decomposed into two parts. The *Gaussian density* part corresponds to Gaussian distribution using the property of Wiener process. The *point process* part is the likelihood for Hawkes processes. Moreover, since parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{A}\}$ are linear in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)$ and parameters $\{\boldsymbol{b}, \beta\}$ are linear in the mean and standard deviation of Gaussian density, the overall objective is *concave*, and the global optimum can be found by many algorithms. In our experiments, we adapt the efficient algorithm developed for Hawkes process in previous work (Zhou et al., 2013) to update $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{A}\}$ and projected gradient descent algorithm to update $\{\boldsymbol{b}, \beta\}$.

I Parameter estimation of the link creation process

Given data $e_i = (t_i, u_i, s_i)$, which means at time t_i node u_i is added to the network and connects to s_i, we set $\mathcal{E} = \{e_i\}$ and optimize the concave log-likelihood function to learn the parameters of the Poisson intensity $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_U)^\top$:

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\geqslant 0} \sum_{e_i\in\mathcal{E}} \log(\sigma_{u_i s_i}(t_i)) - \sum_{u,s\in[n]} \int_0^T \sigma_{us}(\tau)\mathrm{d}\tau$$

This objective function can be solved efficiently with many optimization algorithms, such as Quasi-Newton algorithm (Schmidt et al., 2009).